

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final Office Action of March 8, 2010, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 19 and 23-26 have been amended. Claims 7 and 14 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-26 therefore remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15, 16, 19 and 22-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,870,683 to Wells et al. (“Wells”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,001 to Gonsalves et al. (“Gonsalves”). Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells in view of Gonsalves and further in view of alleged admitted prior art (Specification – p. 8, Table 2, row 5) (“AAPA”). Claims 5, 12, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells in view of Gonsalves and further in view of Bickmore et al., “Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users” (“Bickmore”). Claims 6, 13, 17, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells in view of Gonsalves and Bickmore, and further in view of “GIF Construction Set Professional Homepage” (“GCSPH”) and “GIF Construction Set Professional Manual” (“GCSPM”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, the following:

displaying, on a display of a device, first images of a plurality of time-based sequences of images previously stored within the device;

detecting, by the device, a location of a cursor displayed on the display;

responsive to detecting the cursor being located on a first image of the displayed first images, the device displaying the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image in a predetermined order and with predetermined time intervals between the images, while still displaying the first images of the plurality of time-based sequences of images;

Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found in paragraphs [0033], [0050] and [0051] of Applicants' Specification. Neither Wells nor Gonsalves, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features recited above with respect to claim 1. Although Wells describes at col. 8, lines 6-9 that "a user may select a specific animation sequence to be displayed by scrolling through a plurality of animation sequence choice items, and confirming his choice by depressing the OK softkey," nowhere does Wells teach or suggest, upon detecting a cursor being located on a displayed first image, displaying the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image while still displaying the first images of the plurality of time-based sequences of images.

Gonsalves fails to remedy the deficiencies of Wells with respect to claim 1. Gonsalves generally describes a computer-implemented method in which a graphics editor uses an alpha matte via a graphics workstation to change the original color of an object of a video image frame. See, e.g., Gonsalves at col. 1, lines 60-65; col. 2, lines 48-52. Gonsalves does not teach or suggest displaying first images of a plurality of time-based sequences of images, detecting a location of a cursor, and, responsive to detecting the cursor being located on a first image of the displayed first images, displaying the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image in a predetermined order and with predetermined time intervals between the images, while still displaying the first images of the plurality of time-based sequences of images, as recited in claim 1. Thus, notwithstanding whether Wells and Gonsalves could properly have been combined, the combination fails to teach or suggest all of the recited features of claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 8 and 19 recite similar features as discussed above with respect to claim 1, and are thus allowable over the asserted combination of Wells and Gonsalves at least for similar reasons as claim 1. Dependent claims 2-6, 9-13 15-18 and 22-26 are allowable at least based on the allowability of their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

For example, amended claim 23 recites "receiving a user instruction to add movement to the displaying of the time-based sequence of images associated with the first image on the display of the device, wherein adding movement includes adding a speed and a direction to the displaying of the time-based sequence of images on the display of the device." In rejecting

previous claim 23, the Office Action relies on Wells at col. 5, lines 35-45 and col. 8, lines 23-43 describing Scroll Text Animation in which a text string is scrolled across a display in a Scroll Direction to show the feature of receiving a user instruction to add movement to the at least one image. However, adding a text string to be scrolled across a display in a particular scroll direction is not the same as adding movement, *including a speed and a direction*, to the displaying of a time-based *sequence of images* on a display, as claimed. Further, Wells describes that the text is scrolled at the refresh rate defined for the Scroll Text Animation, and thus does not teach or suggest adding a *speed* to the displaying of a sequence of images. As such, claim 23 is distinguishable over the asserted combination of Wells and Gonsalves for at least these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 7, 2010

By: /Adam Schlosser/
Adam Schlosser
Reg. No. 66,554
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001